

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 15-19 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Rejection Under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to the use of the term “non-paging.” By way of the present Amendment, Applicants have removed this term from the claims, thus rendering this rejection moot.

Rejection Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-3, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Silver et al. (U.S. Patent 5,701,337). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out that Silver et al. shows a wireless communication method between a calling side and a called side including a cellular network 43 and a pager system. Applicants submit that these claims are no longer anticipated by this reference.

Applicants have now amended the claims so that all of the claims now include features relating to the ID number in the wireless systems. This feature is not discussed in Silver et al. This feature was previously included in claim 7 to which the present rejection was not applied.

Further, claim 1 provides a method for communication between a calling side connected to a wireless communication system while the called side is connected to another wireless communication system. Thus, the present invention is based on the premise that two sides are connected to different wireless communication systems. Thus, the wireless communication system can provide a voice communication service which has no paging function by using the

wide-area wireless communication system which is capable of wireless paging so as to reduce the power consumption during standby of a wireless communication terminal.

This differs from Silver et al. which shows a combined mobile phone and pager where the pager activates the mobile phone in order to save the battery energy of the phone. The mobile phone has a switch which is associated with the pager through a relay. When the pager receives a signal, the relay activates the mobile phone. However, this system does not disclose that the calling side and the called side are connected to different wireless communication systems. Further, Silver et al. does not teach the use of an IP network and IP packet communication. Applicants submit that Silver et al. does not teach the pagers of claim 1.

It should be remembered that in the present system, the network can connect a wide-area wireless communication system capable of wireless paging and one or more wireless communication system. A calling side can connect a wide-area wireless communication system and any wireless communication system and a called side connects another wireless communication systems. The network is normally an internet protocol network. The called side should connect to a wide area communication system, however it is not necessary that a calling side be connected to a wide are communication system because the calling side can connect to a wide area communication system through the network. The network may also further connect any cable communication system. So the calling side can connect to a cable communication system provided that the calling side can connect through the network to any wireless communication system or a wide area communication system. This is described in the paragraph on page 20, line 24 of the specification.

Likewise, independent claims 3 and 9 also describe the wireless communication system which utilizes the calling side ID number and the connection of the called side to a different communication system than the calling side. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 3 and 9 are likewise allowable.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 10-12 and 15-17 and 19 depend on these allowable independent claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. New claim 19 now specifically points out that

the calling side can connect to the network through a cable communication system as described in the specification.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Fujimori et al. (U.S. Patent 6,327,475). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is noted that the Examiner has indicated in paragraph 9 on page 10 of the Action that these claims would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 USC 112 rejection. Clearly this contradicts the rejection. Since the summary of the invention indicates that these claims are rejected, it is assumed that the rejection stands and that the indication of allowability was mistaken. The following arguments are based on this understanding.

Fujimori et al. relates to a selective pager capable of group paging or sending a message through a group broadcast transmission and also a selective paging base station which temporarily stores in memory a plurality of telephone numbers and a message received by way of a telephone line which continually transmits the message to the plurality of pagers. Thus, it relates to communication between a telephone and a paging base station, not to a communication between a non-paging wireless communication system and a pager system.

This differs from the present invention which utilizes a wide-area wireless communication base station which can page a called station inherently having no paging function such as a wireless LAN using a paging request receiving means for receiving a pager request using an identification number on the network for a non-paging wireless communication terminal of the called site. The paging wireless communication system has an identifier for location management in the wireless communication terminal and a terminal management system. Thus, the wireless communication system includes a wireless communication system without either the identifier for location management and the terminal management system. This wireless communication system can be a wireless LAN, WAN, or a PAN or an ITS (Intelligent Transport System). This type of arrangement is not described by Fujimori et al. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is likewise allowable.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7 and as such is also considered to be allowable.

Rejection Under 35 USC 103

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Silver et al. and further in view of Tran (U.S. Patent 6,496,693). Claims 5/3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Silver et al. and further in view Blink et al. (U.S. Patent 6,542,751). Claim 5/4 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Silver et al. and Tran and further in view of Blink et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has cited the secondary references to show various features of the dependent claims. However, Applicants submit that even if these references do show these features, these claims remain allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Applicants have also added new claims 15-18 to further describe other features of the invention. These claims remain allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Applicants wish to also further describe the invention in order to make even more clear the relationship between the claimed features and the invention shown in the figures. Thus, the wireless communication system described in claim 1 relates to the wireless LAN base station 5 shown in Fig. 1. Likewise, the wide-area wireless communication system relates to the pager system 6. The communication party 9 is the calling side. The communication party 9 can connect to the pager system in the network directly or through any wireless communication system (not shown in the figures). If the calling side connects the wide-area wireless communication system through a wireless communication system different from the wireless communication connected to the called side, at least two wireless communication systems should be connected to the networks. It should further be noted that the calling side connects to a cable communication system so that the calling side can connect through the network to any wireless communication or the wide-area wireless communication system.

The called side, while not shown in Fig. 1, not only connects to the wireless LAN base station 5 and the calling side (communication party 9) connects to the pager base station 6 directly as shown in Fig. 1 or through another wireless communication system in the network (see paragraph 0073). Thus, the calling side and the called side belong to different wireless communication systems so that this involves heterogeneous wireless communication. If the calling side were connected to a first wireless LAN and a called side were connected to a second wireless LAN, it means that the calling side and the called side belong to different wireless communication systems because the two LANS are unable to communicate with each other directly.

The paging-sending step and the paging step in claim 1 are conducted through a packet communication because the network is an internet protocol network. Therefore, a calling side ID number and a called side ID number on the network may be an IP address and the called side ID number may be a pager ID.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse Reg. No. 22,463 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

 BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant